

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 5, 2007.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed April 5, 2007, Claims 1-62 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 29, 35, 47 and 61-62 (and its dependencies, where applicable) were stated as conflicting with independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 26 and 32 (and its dependencies, where applicable) of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/777,289. Claims 1, 6-9, 14-19, 23-24, 28-29, 35, 41, 43, 47, 50, 52-54 and 60-62 were rejected 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hilbert et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0088570). Claims 2-5, 10-13, 19-21, 25-27, 30-34, 36-40, 42, 44-46, 48-49, 51 and 55-59 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Zhang, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,478), in view of Godlin, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0161860), and further in view of Lamming et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,997).

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 1-5, 9-13, 17-18 and 22-24, cancels Claims 29-62, and adds new Claims 63-88, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-28 and 63-88. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Double Patenting

In the Office Action, independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 29, 35, 47 and 61-62 (and its dependencies, where applicable) were stated as conflicting with independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 26 and 32 (and its dependencies, where applicable) of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/777,289.

The present Response hereby amends the pending independent claims. Furthermore, the claims of U.S. Application No. 10/777,289 have also been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that as amended, the currently pending claims no longer conflict with the claims of U.S. Application No. 10/777,289 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action mailed April 5, 2007, Claims 1, 6-9, 14-19, 23-24, 28-29, 35, 41, 43, 47, 50, 52-54 and 60-62 were rejected 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hilbert et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0088570, hereinafter Hilbert).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *A method for managing access to files and sharing of files between users from remote client devices, the method comprising:
receiving an identifier from a first user of a first client device to an access server;
determining a remote file source associated with the identifier, said remote file source being part of a network;
generating a list of at least one recently used file associated with the file source and the identifier said recently used file having been accessed previously by said first user of the first client device;
presenting an interface enabling access to the list of at least one recently used file by using said first client device;
receiving a request to share the file between said first user of the first client device and a second user at a second client device wherein said second user and second client device are external to said network of the remote file source;
generating a proxy representation of said file on the access server, the proxy representation including a file identifier and credentials for said first user who initiated the request to share the file;
transmitting a link to said second user of the second remote client device in response to said request to share the file, wherein said link references at least one of: a cached copy of said file stored on said access server or the file identified by said file identifier; and
accessing said link by the second user of the second remote client device wherein said accessing causes the access server to provide access to the cached copy of the file if said cached copy is stored on the access server, otherwise provide access directly to the file identified by said file identifier by using said credentials for the first user.*

As amended, Claim 1 defines an intermediary access server that manages the access to files and the sharing of files between remote users. The access server receives an identifier from a user of a client device, determines a file source for the identifier and generates a list of at least

one recently accessed file. The access server can then present an interface to the user which enables access to the recently accessed file. Further, a request to share a file between a first user and a second user is initiated where the second user is external to the network of any file sources which hold the file. In that case, a proxy is generated on the access server which contains the identifier for the file and a set of credentials for the user who initiated the share request. The access server then transmits to the second user a link that references either a cached copy of the file on the access server or the file itself. Once the second user accesses the link, the access server provides access to the cached copy if it is stored on the access server, otherwise, the access server provides access directly to the file on the file source by logging into the file source using the first user's credentials.

The advantages of the features in Claim 1 include the ability to share files between users in remote networks (i.e. separate organizations) in several ways. Since the access server acts as an intermediary, it can maintain cached copies of shared files and provide access to outside users to these cached files. These cached copies can be synchronized with their original versions such that the originals are updated whenever a cached copy is modified. Furthermore, because the sharing user's credentials are contained in the proxy representation on the access server, the access server can also allow an external user to directly access the file by using these credentials to log into the file source. This allows heterogeneous users the ability to share files directly, instead of having to place them into shared web repositories and the like.

Hilbert teaches systems and methods for operating a multi-user document device via a personal device portal. More particularly, Hilbert appears to describe a personal portal that allows a device access to information and resources that may be utilized with the operating capabilities of a device. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Hilbert fails to anticipate the features of Claim 1, as amended.

For example, Hilbert fails to disclose receiving a request to share the file and generating a proxy representation on the access server which contains the identifier for the file and the set of credentials for the user who initiated the share request, as defined in Claim 1. No such proxy representations are described in the Hilbert reference.

Further, Hilbert fails to disclose transmitting to a second user a link that references at least one of: a cached copy of said file stored on said access server and the file identified by said

file identifier, as defined in Claim 1. No such link transmission is described in the Hilbert reference.

Further, Hilbert also fails to disclose accessing the link by the second user, which causes the access server to provide access to the cached copy of the file if it is stored on the server, as defined in Claim 1. If no cached copy is stored, the access server provides access directly to the file identified by the file identifier via the first user's credentials, as defined in Claim 1. Hilbert does not describe such functionality.

In view of the above comments and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 9, 17 and 23

Claims 1, 9, 17 and 23, while independently patentable, recite limitations that, similarly to those described above with respect to claim 1, are not taught, suggested nor otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-8, 14-16, 18-19, 24 and 28

Claims 6-8, 14-16, 18-19, 24 and 28 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6-8, 14-16, 18-19, 24 and 28 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed April 5, 2007, Claims 2-5, 10-13, 19-21, 25-27, 30-34, 36-40, 42, 44-46, 48-49, 51, and 55-59 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Zhang, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,478, hereinafter Zhang), in view of Godlin, et al. (U.S.

Publication No. 2002/0161860, hereinafter Godlin), and further in view of Lamming et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,997, hereinafter Lamming).

Claims 2-5, 10-13, 19-21, 25-27

Claims 2-5, 10-13, 19-21, 25-27 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-5, 10-13, 19-21, 25-27 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 29-62

Claims 29-62 have been canceled thereby rendering moot any rejection as to those claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any canceled and originally presented claims in a continuing or future application.

VI. Additional Amendments

The present Response hereby adds new Claims 63-88. Applicants respectfully submit that the new Claims are allowable over the cited references and consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including August 27, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment

to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 27, 2007

By: /Justas Geringson/
Justas Geringson
Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928